

REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Office Action dated January 7, 2005, and has made amendments to the claims. Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 13 and 25 have been amended. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0033642 to Abrishami ("Abrishami"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 6 and 18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original claims 5 and 6. Furthermore, claim 13 has been amended to include the limitations of original claims 17 and 18. Claim 25 has also been amended to incorporate the limitations of either original claims 5 and 6 or original claims 17 and 18. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13 and 25, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom are now allowable over the prior art.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 3, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0033642 to Abrishami ("Abrishami") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,307 to Kim ("Kim"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the amendments and remarks made with respect to independent claims 1 and 13 above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 13 are allowable. Because claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 14 and 15 are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.


If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: April 7, 2005

By: _____



Lew Edward V. Macapagal
Registration No. 55,416
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka
801 S. Figueroa Street, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: 213-623-2221
Facsimile: 213-623-2211